



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

aApplicant	City of Banning Department of Public Works	County	Riverside
Project Title	Development of a Groundwater Management Plan	Grant Request	\$ 247,880.00
		Total Project Cost	\$ 312,295.00

Project Description: The Proposal consists of preparing a groundwater management plan for Banning Storage Units to manage groundwater in a sustainable manner to improve stormwater run-off, recycled water, and imported water management.

Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	3
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	5
Work Plan	10
Budget	5
Schedule	5
QA/QC	3
Past Performance	4
Geographical Balance	0
Total Score	35

- **GWMP or Program:** The main component of the Proposal is for the development of a Ground Water Management Plan, thus no GWMP or equivalent was formally adopted by the submittal date. The Proposal intends to complete the GWMP by December 2014; however no date is indicated for adoption.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The applicant fully addresses the criterion with thorough and well-presented documentation. The applicant provides a complete detailed description of the proposed project including the general purposes and goals of preparing a GWMP and a Groundwater Recharge Feasibility Study (GWRFS); and general descriptions and maps for the project's affected areas. In addition, the applicant demonstrates collaboration with other local agencies with regards to the proposed project and overall management of the affected groundwater basin. The applicant demonstrates a long-term need and merit for the proposed projects by stating the importance of groundwater resources to the city's water supply and thus the necessity of having a state-compliant GWMP and finding potential future conjunctive use projects through the GWRFS. The proposal demonstrates a definite and achievable quantity of new knowledge and improvement in groundwater management would be obtained that is consistent with the development of goals and objectives of the proposed GWMP. Moreover, the applicant clearly describes the ongoing use of the products of the proposed project. Ongoing funding for the project will be through the City of Banning. The proposal sufficiently describes the quality and usefulness of the information that will be obtained and speaks to the technical feasibility of groundwater management utilizing artificial recharge facilities.
- **Work Plan:** The applicant addresses the criterion with thorough documentation. The applicant reasonably describes each task in sufficient detail to determine that a GWMP and GWRFS would be developed. Overall, the tasks are consistent with the schedule and budget, and can reasonably fulfill the objectives of the proposal. In addition, the tasks do relate to improving groundwater management. The work plan presents a strategy for evaluating progress and performance. The work plan identifies deliverables, including quarterly reports and final reports for both projects. The proposal does not address potential for the need to access private property because it is not applicable to the project. The applicant's strategy includes distribution of information to interested parties, stakeholders, agencies, and the general public's involvement and feedback. The six proposed project meeting and briefing discussions are primarily for a focused stakeholder group. The work plan explains that the projects are paper studies and thus do not qualify as a "project" under CEQA.



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

- **Budget:** The criterion is fully addressed and supported by well-presented documentation. Rationale for the proposed budget is presented with some rationales given in the Work Plan. The application includes a budget table and detailed breakdown of the project costs, with rates and hours of personnel. The budget is consistent with the Work Plan and Schedule in the task levels. The proposal identifies other sources of funding and how each task pertains to them.
- **Schedule:** The applicant addresses the criterion with thorough documentation. The timelines seem to be reasonable for the work to be performed. The Schedule does show the project will be able to proceed when funding becomes available based on the start date being shown, and the start and end dates seem to be within the PSP designated time frame.
- **QA/QC:** The applicant did not fully address the criterion and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. The applicant only provides a general summary about the QA/QC measures that will be used in the project and the resume of the individual that will be managing the project. Furthermore, the Proposal does not provide specific data quality objectives for the project; therefore it is difficult to surmise if the QA/QC measures are appropriate. There is no QA/QC description for the GWRFS component. The documentation does not specify that individuals performing groundwater scientific analyses (i.e., well installation and hydrogeologic data collection) will be done under responsible charge of a California-licensed Professional Geologist or Engineer.
- **Past Performance:** The applicant fully addressed the criterion but did not provide thorough documentation. While the applicant presents background of several projects of appropriate size and cost, it does not thoroughly document that the projects were completed on time. The documentation does not include information on project actual completion schedules in relation to proposed schedules.